

The Honorable Robert S. Lasnik

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

STATE OF WASHINGTON; STATE OF
CONNECTICUT; STATE OF MARYLAND;
STATE OF NEW JERSEY; STATE OF NEW
YORK; STATE OF OREGON;
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS;
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA;
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; STATE OF
CALIFORNIA; STATE OF COLORADO;
STATE OF DELAWARE; STATE OF HAWAII;
STATE OF ILLINOIS; STATE OF IOWA;
STATE OF MINNESOTA; STATE OF NORTH
CAROLINA; STATE OF RHODE ISLAND;
STATE OF VERMONT and
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE;
MICHAEL R. POMPEO, in his official capacity
as Secretary of State; DIRECTORATE OF
DEFENSE TRADE CONTROLS; MIKE
MILLER, in his official capacity as Acting Deputy
Assistant Secretary of Defense Trade Controls;
SARAH HEIDEMA, in her official capacity as
Director of Policy, Office of Defense Trade
Controls Policy; DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED;
SECOND AMENDMENT FOUNDATION, INC.;
AND CONN WILLIAMSON,

Defendants.

NO. 2:18-cv-01115-RSL

PLAINTIFF STATES' MOTION TO
COMPEL DISCOVERY
RESPONSES

**NOTE FOR CONSIDERATION:
DECEMBER 21, 2018**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a) and LCR 37(a), the Plaintiff States respectfully move for an order compelling the Private Defendants to respond to *Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production to the Private Defendants* (the Requests).

I. INTRODUCTION

The States' Requests are narrowly tailored to seek information about one specific issue: the Private Defendants' involvement in any export of 3D-printable firearm files following the Court's issuance of a temporary restraining order (TRO) and preliminary injunction rendering such export unlawful. The Private Defendants have largely failed to respond substantively to the Requests, aside from providing limited answers to a few interrogatories and boilerplate, non-responsive answers of dubious accuracy to other Requests. The States respectfully ask the Court to compel the Private Defendants to respond to each disputed Request.¹

The States propounded the Requests after learning that, on or about August 24, 2018—a few weeks after the Court issued the TRO—Defense Distributed published a video on YouTube featuring Cody Wilson encouraging third parties to host the files online in violation of federal law as established by the TRO. The video urged others to “HOST OR PAY”: “host the files or pay the tax for the men who will,” and promised “two new contracts” in return. The “2nd Amendment Foundation” is listed as a “partner” in the video. In addition, Defense Distributed has transmitted the files by means other than posting them online, but it remains unclear what steps, if any, the company is taking to ensure its distribution does not involve unlawful exports to non-U.S. persons. These actions by parties to this case raise serious questions about potential ongoing harm and the Private Defendants' efforts to undermine the injunction. The targeted discovery sought by the States is warranted.

¹ For the Court's convenience, a chart providing a high-level summary the disputed Requests and arguments made herein is attached as Exhibit 12 to the Declaration of Kristin Beneski.

II. RELEVANT FACTS

A. The TRO and Preliminary Injunction

On July 30, 2018, the Plaintiff States filed this lawsuit and an emergency motion for a TRO, seeking to prevent irreparable harm that would have been caused if Defense Distributed followed through with its plans to post on the internet 3D-printable files that can be used to automatically manufacture the “Liberator” pistol and other untraceable, undetectable weapons. Dkt. ## 1, 2. Defense Distributed had announced that it planned to post the files online on August 1, 2018, as permitted by the Federal Defendants, per a reversal of their previous regulatory position that posting the files online was an unlawful export of defense articles. *See* Dkt. # 2, pp. 19–20.

On July 31, 2018, the Court issued a TRO enjoining the Federal Defendants from implementing or enforcing their “Temporary Modification of Category I of the United States Munitions List” and the letter to Cody R. Wilson, Defense Distributed, and Second Amendment Foundation issued by the U.S. Department of State on July 27, 2018, and to “preserve the status quo *ex ante* as if the modification had not occurred and the letter had not been issued.” Dkt. # 23, p. 7. On August 27, 2018, the Court converted the temporary restraining order to a preliminary injunction. Dkt. # 95, p. 25. The effect of these orders was to preserve the status quo in which it is a violation of federal law to post on the internet, or otherwise export, files that can be used to automatically manufacture firearms and other weapons using a 3D printer.

In response to the TRO, Defense Distributed removed its files from its website. *See* Dkt. # 63 (Private Defs’ Opp. to Mot. for PI), p. 7 (characterizing the TRO as a “take-down order” with which Defense Distributed “complied”); *see also* Beneski Decl., Ex. 3 (Supplemental Responses), pp. 8, 10, 21, 24 (acknowledging that the injunction pertains to “publication via Defense Distributed’s internet website”).

B. Defense Distributed Urges Others to Host the Files, and Continues Distribution

On August 24, 2018—while the TRO was in effect—the States became aware that Defense Distributed had posted a video on YouTube encouraging third parties to host the 3D-printable firearm files online. Beneski Decl., Ex. 4² & ¶ 6. The video, which featured Defense Distributed’s then-director Cody Wilson, encouraged others to “HOST OR PAY”:



Id. A voiceover accompanying the “HOST OR PAY” image above called on others to “host the files or pay the tax for the men who will.” *Id.* In return, Defense Distributed promised to “offer two new contracts to you.” *Id.* The video listed among “Our Partners” the “2nd Amendment Foundation.” *Id.* The States promptly contacted Defense Distributed’s counsel about the video, who reported a few days later that it had been changed. *Id.*, Ex. 5.

In addition, after the Court issued the preliminary injunction, Defense Distributed offered to sell copies of the files and deliver them to customers by means other than posting them on the internet. *See, e.g., id.*, Ex. 2 (Responses), p. 9 (referencing Defense Distributed’s “customers”); Ex. 6 (Twitter page advertising “Files on sale now”); Exs. 7 & 8 (news reports). It is not clear what steps, if any, Defense Distributed has taken to ensure that its distributions are not exports to non-U.S. persons, or to determine whether recipients of the files are ineligible to possess firearms. *See id.* Ex. 8 (reporting that at an August 28, 2018 press conference, Cody Wilson “refused to answer a question about the potential for foreign nationals to access the plans”).

² Exhibit 4, a DVD containing a copy of the video, is being submitted to the Clerk’s Office.

1 **C. The States’ Discovery Requests and the Private Defendants’ Initial Objections**

2 On September 20, 2018, the States issued *Plaintiffs’ First Set of Interrogatories and*
 3 *Requests for Production to the Private Defendants* (the Requests). Beneski Decl., ¶ 3 & Ex. 1.
 4 The Requests, which are limited in number and scope, seek information related to the “Host or
 5 Pay” video, as well as other actions the Private Defendants may have taken with respect to
 6 potentially unlawful distribution of 3D-printable firearm files on or after July 31, 2018.³

7 To briefly summarize, *Interrogatory (“Rog”) 1* seeks identification of individuals who
 8 are affiliated with or have authority to act on behalf of Defense Distributed. *Id.*, Ex. 1, p. 5. *Rog*
 9 *3* and *Request for Production (“RFP”) 1, 5, and 6* ask whether the Private Defendants facilitated
 10 or assisted anyone in making the files publicly available via the internet on or after July 31, 2018,
 11 and seek information and documents related to any post-injunction distribution or sale of the
 12 files. *Id.*, pp. 5–6, 8, 9–10. *Rogs 4, 5, and 6* and *RFPs 2, 3, and 6* seek information and
 13 documents related to the manner in which the Private Defendants distributed any of the files on
 14 or after July 31, 2018, and any steps the Private Defendants took or information they collected
 15 to determine whether the recipients of the files are U.S. persons, whether they are located within
 16 the United States, and whether they may lawfully possess a firearm. *Id.*, pp. 6–7, 8–9, 10. *Rog 9*
 17 and *RFPs 4 and 6* seek information and documents related to the “Host or Pay” video and any
 18 other documents related to the Private Defendants’ participation in any proposed, planned, or
 19 actual sale or distribution of the files on or after July 31, 2018. *Id.*, pp. 7–8, 9, 10. In sum, each
 20 Request seeks information about the Private Defendants’ involvement in any potentially
 21 unlawful post-injunction export of 3D-printable firearm files.

22
 23 ³ The Private Defendants gave a responsive answer to Rog 2. The States are not currently seeking to
 24 compel responses to Rogs 7 and 8 or RFP 7, which seek information and documents related to criminal activity by
 representatives of Defense Distributed. News reports indicate that the company’s co-founder, Cody Wilson, is
 facing criminal charges in Texas. He is no longer the company’s director. *See* Beneski Decl. Ex. 3, p. 4.

On October 22, 2018, the Private Defendants responded by objecting to each Request in its entirety without providing, or indicating that they would provide, any substantive response. Beneski Decl., Ex. 2. Their primary objection was that their Rule 12(c) motion was then pending, and that they would not be obligated to participate in any party discovery if the motion were granted. *Id.* at 2, 13. They also objected to each Request based on relevance and various derivative or related grounds, arguing that the Requests are “not relevant” because there are no claims against them and they are not directly enjoined. *See generally id.*

D. Efforts to Resolve Discovery Disputes

On November 2, 2018, the States sent a letter to counsel for the Private Defendants addressing deficiencies in their responses to the Requests. *Id.*, Ex. 9. The Private Defendants did not respond substantively, but the parties agreed to postpone efforts to resolve any discovery disputes until after the Court had ruled on the Private Defendants’ 12(c) motion. *Id.*, ¶ 11. The Court entered a stipulated order on November 7, 2018. Dkt. # 127. On November 13, 2018, the Court denied the Private Defendants’ 12(c) motion. Dkt. # 130.

On November 16, the States’ counsel inquired whether the Private Defendants intended to amend or supplement their discovery responses in light of the Court’s order, and requested that they do so by November 26—or alternatively, that they provide dates and times for a meet-and-confer. Beneski Decl., Ex. 10. They received no response by the requested deadline. *See id.*

Ultimately, counsel for the parties met and conferred on Friday, November 30. *Id.*, ¶ 13. Counsel for the Private Defendants stated that they would answer Rog 2, but would not substantively respond to any of the other Requests, and promised to serve supplemental responses on Monday, December 3. *Id.* Counsel for the States advised that they intended to file a motion to compel responses to the remaining disputed Requests by the Tuesday, December 4 deadline for discovery-related motions. *Id.*

E. The Private Defendants’ Amended Objections and Responses

After the close of business on December 3, the night before the discovery-motions deadline, the Private Defendants provided supplemental responses. Exs. 3 & 11; ¶ 14. They answered Rogs 1, 2, and 3, and stated that they had no responsive documents to RFP 1. Ex. 3, pp. 4, 5, 7, 20. They refused to respond to Rog 9, *id.* at 16–17, and their “respon[s]” to the other Requests are largely non-responsive boilerplate stating that they “did not assist or facilitate any other person” in making the files publicly available on the internet. *See generally id.*

Although the responses to RFPs 2–6 misleadingly state that the “Private Defendants have no nonprivileged documents . . .,” this is part of the boilerplate non-responsive statement, and each RFP response *also* states that “[r]esponsive materials are being withheld . . .” *Id.* at 19, 21, 23, 26, 28, 31, 34. The supplemental responses also assert untimely new objections, all of which are waived and thus not addressed in this motion. *See RichmarkCorp v. Timber Falling Consultants*, 959 F.2d 1468, 1473 (9th Cir. 1992) (“It is well established that a failure to object to discovery requests within the time required constitutes waiver of any objection.”).⁴

III. RULE 37(a) CERTIFICATION

The undersigned hereby certify that they conferred in good faith with counsel for the Private Defendants via telephone on November 30, 2018, prior to filing this motion. The participants in the conference were Chad Flores, Joel Ard, Jeffrey Rupert, and Kristin Beneski.

IV. ARGUMENT

A. Legal Standard

Parties may obtain discovery regarding “any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party’s claim or defense and proportional to the needs of the case” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1).

⁴ The waived objections are based on the First and Fourteenth Amendments; a purported “conc[ession]” that mischaracterizes the States’ position; and vagueness as to the terms “assist” and “facilitate.” To avoid confusion, the States cite the Private Defendants’ original responses below in addressing the un-waived objections.

The scope of discovery should be “liberally construed”; Rule 26 “contemplates discovery into any matter that bears on or that reasonably could lead to other matters that could bear on any issue that is or may be raised in a case.” *McArthur v. Rock Woodfired Pizza & Spirits*, 318 F.R.D. 136, 143 (W.D. Wash. 2016). Courts should generally permit discovery unless the requests have “no conceivable bearing on the case.” Wright & Miller, *Federal Practice & Procedure*, § 2008 (3d ed.). “The party who resists discovery has the burden to show that discovery should not be allowed, and has the burden of clarifying, explaining, and supporting objections.” *Everest Indem. Ins. Co. v. QBE Ins. Corp.*, 980 F. Supp. 2d 1273, 1277 (W.D. Wash. 2013). Untimely objections are waived. *RichmarkCorp*, 959 F.2d at 1473; *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b)(4).

B. The Requests Seek Highly Relevant Information

The Private Defendants’ primary objection is that the Requests are “not relevant.” They assert that “[t]his action does not involve any claim against the Private Defendants” and “[t]he Court’s preliminary injunction does not address the Private Defendants; it addresses only the Federal Defendants.” *See generally* Beneski Decl., Ex. 2. Even if true, this is not dispositive and does not render the requested information irrelevant—far from it.

1. The Private Defendants’ conduct is central to this case

The Requests easily clear the threshold of seeking information that “bears on” issues that have been or may be raised in this case. *McArthur*, 318 F.R.D. at 143. It does not matter that no claims are asserted against the Private Defendants, for this case would not even exist without them. Defense Distributed’s years-long quest for the right to export 3D-printable firearm files, its plans to post the files on the internet following the Federal Defendants’ regulatory reversal, and the extensive harm that widespread dissemination of the files would cause to the States, are all central to the States’ complaint and their requests for injunctive relief. *See* Dkt. # 29 (First Amended Complaint), ¶¶ 2–6, 38–217; Dkt. # 2 (Motion for TRO), pp. 3, 18–23; Dkt. # 43 (Motion for

1 PI), pp. 1, 19–24. In issuing the TRO and preliminary injunction, the Court found a “likelihood
2 of irreparable injury” to the States if Defense Distributed were to follow through with its plans
3 to broadly disseminate the files. Dkt. # 95 (Order), p. 7; *see also id.* at 20.

4 The “Host or Pay” video is evidence that Defense Distributed, as well as the Second
5 Amendment Foundation, continued supporting efforts to illegally export the files even after the
6 injunction issued. Although the Private Defendants knew they could not lawfully post the files
7 on the internet themselves, they urged others to “host the files or pay the tax for the men who
8 will.” In addition, Defense Distributed has evidently distributed the files by mail after the
9 injunction issued, and may well have done so without taking reasonable steps to determine
10 whether the mailings are unlawful exports—such as by determining recipients’ citizenship.
11 Indeed, as discussed below, the Private Defendants appear to have an exceedingly narrow
12 understanding of what it means to “export” the files in violation of federal law: they erroneously
13 believe it is limited only to posting the files on their own website. Their mistaken belief
14 underscores the need for discovery to determine whether and to what extent they may be
15 involved in illegal and dangerous exports. Similarly, Defense Distributed may well be mailing
16 the files to individuals who are ineligible to possess firearms, without checking their age,
17 criminal history, or other eligibility requirements. The threat of “violations of gun control laws”
18 if 3D-printable firearm files were to proliferate is a significant aspect of the harm to which the
19 injunction was addressed. Dkt. # 95, p. 10.

20 These activities, and any other involvement in exporting the files or otherwise creating a
21 threat of harm to the States, would therefore be highly relevant to these proceedings. Complete
22 responses to all of the disputed Requests will reveal whether there is an ongoing threat of harm
23 that may require further action by the States, and may provide evidence of harm to support the
24 States’ ultimate request for permanent injunctive relief.

1 **2. The Private Defendants have a duty not to undermine the injunction**

2 The fact that the Private Defendants are not directly enjoined likewise does not render
3 the Requests irrelevant. It is enough that the Private Defendants’ conduct with respect to the files
4 clearly “bears on” the issues in this case, as discussed above. In addition, inasmuch as the Private
5 Defendants are “parties” with “actual notice” of the injunction (Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d)(2)), they
6 have a duty to refrain from actively undermining the injunction’s effectiveness—including by
7 encouraging or facilitating violations by others.

8 An injunction binds “the parties,” their “officers, agents, servants, employees, and
9 attorneys,” and “other persons who are in active concert or participation with” any of the above,
10 as long as such persons “receive actual notice” of the injunction. Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d)(2). Any
11 party subject to an injunction must take “all reasonable steps within the party’s power to
12 comply.” *In re Dual-Deck Video Cassette Recorder Antitrust Litig.*, 10 F.3d 693, 695 (9th Cir.
13 1993). A party may also be held liable for knowingly aiding and abetting another to violate a
14 court order. *See Regal Knitwear Co. v. NLRB*, 324 U.S. 9, 14 (1945) (“defendants may not
15 nullify a decree by carrying out prohibited acts through aiders and abettors, although they were
16 not parties to the original proceeding”). Furthermore, “[e]very affirmative order in equity carries
17 with it the implicit command to refrain from action designed to defeat it.” *NLRB v. Deena*
18 *Artware, Inc.*, 361 U.S. 398, 413 (1960) (Frankfurter, J., concurring). “In deciding whether an
19 injunction has been violated it is proper to observe the objects for which the relief was granted
20 and to find a breach of the decree in a violation of the spirit of the injunction, even though its
21 strict letter may not have been disregarded.” *John B. Stetson Co. v. Stephen L. Stetson Co.*, 128
22 F.2d 981, 983 (2d Cir. 1941).

23 Here, as discussed above, the Court found in issuing the injunction that “the States will
24 likely suffer irreparable injury if the technical data for designing and producing undetectable

1 weapons using a commercially-available 3D printer are published on the internet.” Dkt. # 95 p.
 2 20. Any actions by parties to this case encouraging, inciting, causing, or failing to take all
 3 reasonable steps to prevent the posting of the files on the internet or otherwise export them would
 4 violate the purpose and spirit of the injunction. The “Host or Pay” video is already one example,
 5 and the Requests seek further information about the video and any other evidence of the Private
 6 Defendants’ involvement in posting or otherwise illegally distributing the files. Again, this
 7 discovery will enable the States to determine whether any violations are occurring and to
 8 evaluate the possibilities for remediation if so.

9 **C. The Private Defendants’ Effort to Limit the Requests to “Defense Distributed’s**
 10 **Internet Website” Reflect an Overly Narrow Understanding of an “Export”**

11 The Private Defendants insist that several Requests are “overly broad and unduly
 12 burdensome” because “the action’s claims and the Court’s preliminary injunction pertain only
 13 to publication via Defense Distributed’s internet website,” not any other methods of file
 14 distribution. Beneski Decl., Ex. 2, pp. 8, 10, 21, 24, 27, 29, 32. They read the claims and the
 15 injunction far too narrowly. The injunction restores the status quo in which it is a violation of
 16 federal law to *export* 3D-printable firearm files. An “export” includes not only online posting,
 17 but also “sending a defense article out of the United States in any manner” and “transferring
 18 technical data to a foreign person in the United States,” among other activities. 22 CFR § 120.17.

19 Rogs 4–6 and RFPs 2–6 seek information related to the Private Defendants’ involvement
 20 in any sale or distribution of the files by any means, including information that will reveal
 21 whether and to what extent Defense Distributed attempted to determine whether the recipients
 22 of the files it distributed were “foreign persons” and whether they were located in the United
 23 States—i.e., whether the distributions were “exports.” This in turn will show whether Defense
 24 Distributed actually exported files in violation of federal law in light of the injunction (or whether

1 it acted with reckless disregard as to whether it was exporting them).

2 **D. The Private Defendants’ Objections Based on Their Rule 12(c) Motion Are Moot**

3 The Private Defendants initially objected that they “should not be required to comply
4 with any [Request] unless and until the Court resolves their Rule 12 motion.” Ex. 2 at 2, 13.
5 Even after the Court denied the Private Defendants’ Rule 12 motion, Dkt. # 130, they renewed
6 this objection. *See* Ex. 3, pp. 2, 18. It is now moot and no longer has any conceivable merit.

7 **E. The Private Defendants Fail to Assert Any Other Meritorious Objections**

8 The remaining objections based on proportionality, burdensomeness, impropriety, and
9 the like lack merit because they are generic, unexplained, and unsupported. *See, e.g., Krausz*
10 *Indus., Ltd. v. Romac Indus., Inc.*, No. C10-1204RSL, 2011 WL 13100750, at *1 n.1 (W.D.
11 Wash. Aug. 10, 2011) (“boilerplate objections” are “not sufficient”). Further, these objections
12 fail to the extent they are derivative of the meritless objections discussed above.

13 **F. The Private Defendants Should Be Compelled to Fully Respond to All Disputed Requests**

14 The Private Defendants failed to respond to Rog 9, which seeks information about the
15 “Host or Pay” video. Ex. 3, pp. 16–17. Their supplemental “responses” to Rogs 4–6 and RFPs
16 2–6 are not really responses, but boilerplate stating that they “did not assist or facilitate” others
17 in posting the files via the internet. This boilerplate is not responsive to these Requests.

18 The “did not assist or facilitate” boilerplate *is* responsive to Rog 3 and RFP 1, but
19 troublingly, it is in tension with the “Host or Pay” video, in which Defense Distributed promises
20 “two new contracts” to those who “host the files or pay the tax for the men who will.” The Private
21 Defendants also assert a new (waived) objection to the terms “assist” and “facilitate”—leaving
22 it unclear how they understood those terms for purposes of their supplemental responses to Rog
23 3 and RFP 1. *Id.*, pp. 6–7, 19–20. The supplemental response to RFP 1 also incongruously states
24

1 that the Private Defendants “have no nonprivileged documents concerning or relating to” RFP
 2 1, but at the same time that “[r]esponsive materials are being withheld” on the basis of the stated
 3 objections (which do not include privilege). *Id.*, pp. 19–20.

4 Further, it is unclear whether the supplemental answers to Rogs 1 and 5 are complete.
 5 Rog 1 seeks identification of “all” persons affiliated with Defense Distributed, and the
 6 supplemental answer identifies only two individuals—Defense Distributed’s “Director” and its
 7 “co-founde[r].” *Id.* at 4. Presumably, there is at least one other unidentified co-founder, and
 8 perhaps other unidentified individuals. Rog 5 seeks a description of “any” methods by which the
 9 Private Defendants have distributed the files, and the supplemental answer identifies only one
 10 method—United States Postal Service mail—without indicating whether it is the only method.
 11 *Id.* at 11. Normally, such matters would be clarified during a meet-and-confer, but since the
 12 Private Defendants stated that they only intended to supplement Rog 2 and did not provide their
 13 supplemental responses until the night before the deadline to file discovery-related motions,
 14 there was no opportunity to confer meaningfully about these responses.

15 As to any responses that may be incomplete or are withholding information, the States
 16 respectfully request that the Private Defendants be compelled to respond in full.

17 **V. REQUEST FOR ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND OTHER EXPENSES**

18 Should this motion be granted, the Plaintiff States respectfully request that the Court
 19 award their attorneys’ fees and other expenses incurred in making this motion. *See* Fed. R. Civ.
 20 P. 37(a)(5). If the Court does so, the States will submit evidence of their reasonable expenses.

21 **VI. CONCLUSION**

22 For the reasons above, the Plaintiff States respectfully request that the Court compel the
 23 Private Defendants to provide substantive and complete responses to Rogs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9,
 24 and RFPs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and that the Court award the States’ reasonable expenses and fees.

1 DATED this 4th day of December, 2018.

2 ROBERT W. FERGUSON
3 Attorney General

4 /s/ Jeffrey Rupert

JEFFREY RUPERT, WSBA #45037
Division Chief

5 KRISTIN BENESKI, WSBA #45478
Assistant Attorney General

6 TODD BOWERS, WSBA #25274
Deputy Attorney General

7 JEFF SPRUNG, WSBA #23607

ZACH JONES, WSBA #44557

8 Assistant Attorneys General

JeffreyR2@atg.wa.gov

9 KristinB1@atg.wa.gov

ToddB@atg.wa.gov

10 JeffS2@atg.wa.gov

ZachJ@atg.wa.gov

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Washington

12 GEORGE JEPSEN
13 Attorney General of Connecticut

14 /s/ Maura Murphy Osborne

MAURA MURPHY OSBORNE, CT-19987
Assistant Attorney General

15 Connecticut Office of Attorney General
55 Elm St. P.O. Box 120

16 Hartford, CT 06141-0120

Maura.murphyosborne@ct.gov

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Connecticut

18 BRIAN E. FROSH
19 Attorney General of Maryland

20 /s/ Julia Doyle Bernhardt

JULIA DOYLE BERNHARDT
Assistant Attorneys General

21 Office of the Attorney General
200 Saint Paul Place, 20th Floor
22 Baltimore, MD 21202
(410) 576-7291

23 jbernhardt@oag.state.md.us

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Maryland

24 GURBIR GREWAL

Attorney General of New Jersey

/s/ Jeremy M. Feigenbaum

JEREMY M. FEIGENBAUM

Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General

Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex

25 Market Street, 8th Floor, West Wing

Trenton, NJ 08625-0080

(609) 376-2690

Jeremy.Feigenbaum@njoag.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of New Jersey

BARABARA D. UNDERWOOD

Attorney General of New York

/s/ Steven Wu

STEVEN WU

Attorney General of New York

28 Liberty Street

New York, NY 10005

steven.wu@ag.ny.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of New York

MAURA HEALEY

Attorney General of Commonwealth of

Massachusetts

/s/ Jonathan B. Miller

JONATHAN B. MILLER

Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Massachusetts Attorney General

One Ashburton Place

Boston, MA 02108

(617) 963-2073

Jonathan.Miller@state.ma.us

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Commonwealth of
Massachusetts*

JOSH SHAPIRO

Attorney General of Commonwealth of

Pennsylvania

/s/ Jonathan Scott Goldman

JONATHAN SCOTT GOLDMAN

Executive Deputy Attorney General

Civil Division

Office of Attorney General
Strawberry Square, 15th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120
717-783-1471
jgoldman@attorneygeneral.gov

/s/ Michael J. Fischer

MICHAEL J FISCHER
Pennsylvania Office of the Attorney General
1600 Arch Street, Ste 300
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-560-2171
mfischer@attorneygeneral.gov
*Attorney for Plaintiff Commonwealth of
Pennsylvania*

KARL A. RACINE
Attorney General for the District of Columbia

/s/ Robyn Bender

Deputy Attorney General
Public Advocacy Division
Robyn.bender@dc.gov

/s/ Jimmy Rock

Assistant Deputy Attorney General
Public Advocacy Division
202-741-0770
Jimmy.Rock@dc.gov

/s/ Andrew J. Saindon

Senior Assistant Attorney General
202-724-6643
andy.saindon@dc.gov
Office of the Attorney General for the
District of Columbia
441 4th Street NW, Ste 630 South
Washington, DC 20001
Attorneys for Plaintiff District of Columbia

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM
Attorney General of Oregon

/s/ Scott J. Kaplan

SCOTT J. KAPLAN, WSBA #49377
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Oregon Department of Justice

1 100 SW Market Street
2 Portland, OR 97201
3 (971) 673-1880
4 scott.kaplan@doj.state.or.us
5 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Oregon*

6 XAVIER BECERRA
7 Attorney General of California

8 */s/ Nelson R. Richards*

9 NELSON R. RICHARDS
10 Deputy Attorney General
11 California Department of Justice
12 Office of the Attorney General
13 2550 Mariposa Mall, Rm 5090
14 Fresno, CA 93721
15 559-705-2324
16 Nelson.richards@doj.ca.gov
17 *Attorneys for the State of California*

18 CYNTHIA H. COFFMAN
19 Attorney General of Colorado

20 */s/ Matthew D. Grove*

21 MATTHEW D. GROVE
22 Assistant Solicitor General
23 Colorado Department of Law
24 1300 Broadway, 6th Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203
Telephone: (720) 508-6157
FAX: (720) 508-6041
E-Mail: matt.grove@coag.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Colorado

MATTHEW P. DENN
Attorney General of Delaware

/s/ Ilona M. Kirshon

ILONA M. KIRSHON (#3705)
Deputy State Solicitor
State of Delaware Department of Justice
Carvel State Office Building, 6th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 577-8400
Ilona.kirshon@state.de.us

/s/ Patricia A. Davis

PATRICIA A. DAVIS (#3857)
Deputy Attorney General
State of Delaware Department of Justice

Dover, DE 19904
(302) 257-3233
patriciaA.davis@state.de.us
Attorneys for the Plaintiff State of Delaware

RUSSELL A. SUZUKI
Attorney General of Hawaii

/s/ Robert T. Nakatsuji
ROBERT T. NAKATSUJI
Deputy Attorney General
Department of the Attorney General
425 Queen Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
(808) 586-1360
Robert.T.Nakatsuji@hawaii.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Hawaii

LISA MADIGAN
Attorney General of Illinois

/s/ Brett E. Legner
BRETT E. LEGNER
Deputy Solicitor General
Office of the Attorney General
100 W. Randolph, 12th Floor
Chicago, IL 60601
blegner@atg.state.il.us
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Illinois

THOMAS J. MILLER
Attorney General of Iowa

/s/ Nathanael Blake
NATHANAEL BLAKE
Office of the Attorney General of Iowa
Hoover State Office Bldg., 2nd Floor
1305 East Walnut Street
Des Moines, IA 50319
(515) 281-4325
nathan.blake@ag.iowa.gov
Attorneys for the Plaintiff State of Iowa

LORI SWANSON
Attorney General of Minnesota

/s/ Jacob Campion

JACOB CAMPION, MN Reg. #0391274
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Minnesota Attorney General
445 Minnesota Street, Suite 1100
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2128
(651) 757-1459
jacob.campion@ag.state.mn.us
Attorneys for the Plaintiff State of Minnesota

JOSHUA H. STEIN
Attorney General of North Carolina

/s/ Sripriya Narasimhan
SRIPRIYA NARASIMHAN
Deputy General Counsel
North Carolina Department of Justice
114 W. Edenton St.
Raleigh, NC 27603
(919) 716-6421
snarasimhan@ncdoj.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of North Carolina

PETER F. KILMARTIN
Attorney General of Rhode Island

/s/ Susan Urso
SUSAN URSO
Assistant Attorney General
150 South Main Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903
(401) 274-4400
surso@riag.ri.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Rhode Island

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.
Attorney General of Vermont

/s/ Benjamin D. Battles
BENJAMIN D. BATTLES
Solicitor General
Office of the Attorney General
109 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05609-1001
(802) 828-5500
benjamin.battles@vermont.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Vermont

MARK R. HERRING
Attorney General of the
Commonwealth of Virginia

/s/ Samuel T. Towell

SAMUEL T. TOWELL
Deputy Attorney General, Civil Litigation
Office of the Attorney General of Virginia
Barbara Johns Building
202 N. Ninth Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 786-6731
STowell@oag.state.va.us
*Attorney for Plaintiff Commonwealth of
Virginia*

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 4, 2018, I caused the foregoing document to be electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will serve a copy of this document upon all counsel of record.

DATED this 4th day of December, 2018, at Seattle, Washington.

/s/ Jeffrey Rupert
JEFFREY RUPERT

The Honorable Robert S. Lasnik

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

STATE OF WASHINGTON; STATE OF
CONNECTICUT; STATE OF MARYLAND;
STATE OF NEW JERSEY; STATE OF NEW
YORK; STATE OF OREGON;
COMMONWEALTH OF
MASSACHUSETTS; COMMONWEALTH
OF PENNSYLVANIA; DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA; STATE OF CALIFORNIA;
STATE OF COLORADO; STATE OF
DELAWARE; STATE OF HAWAII; STATE
OF ILLINOIS; STATE OF IOWA; STATE
OF MINNESOTA; STATE OF NORTH
CAROLINA; STATE OF RHODE ISLAND;
STATE OF VERMONT and
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
STATE; MICHAEL R. POMPEO, in his
official capacity as Secretary of State;
DIRECTORATE OF DEFENSE TRADE
CONTROLS; MIKE MILLER, in his official
capacity as Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary
of Defense Trade Controls; SARAH
HEIDEMA, in her official capacity as Director
of Policy, Office of Defense Trade Controls
Policy; DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED; SECOND
AMENDMENT FOUNDATION, INC.; AND
CONN WILLIAMSON,

Defendants.

NO. 2:18-cv-01115-RSL

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF
STATES' MOTION TO COMPEL
DISCOVERY RESPONSES

[PROPOSED]

**NOTE FOR CONSIDERATION:
DECEMBER 21, 2018**

1 This matter came before the Court on the Plaintiff States' Motion to Compel Discovery
 2 Responses. The Court has considered all briefing on the motion and documents filed therewith,
 3 including declarations and exhibits; the arguments of counsel; and the entire record in this case.

4 Having considered the foregoing, the Court finds that the Private Defendants' objections
 5 to *Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production to the Private Defendants*
 6 (Requests) are insufficient and lack merit, and that the Private Defendants improperly failed to
 7 respond in full to each of the disputed Requests. The Court further finds that any objections not
 8 asserted within 30 days after service of the Requests are untimely and therefore waived. *See*
 9 *RichmarkCorp v. Timber Falling Consultants*, 959 F.2d 1468, 1473 (9th Cir. 1992).

10 The Private Defendants are hereby ordered to provide complete answers to Interrogatory
 11 Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9, and to provide complete responses to Request for Production Nos. 1, 2,
 12 3, 4, 5, and 6, no later than _____.

13 The Plaintiff States are hereby awarded their reasonable expenses, including attorneys'
 14 fees, incurred in making the Motion to Compel Discovery Responses. The States shall submit
 15 evidence of their reasonable expenses no later than _____. The Private Defendants may
 16 submit a response no later than _____.

17 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2018.

18
 19 _____
 20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
 21
 22
 23
 24

1 Presented By:

2 ROBERT W. FERGUSON
3 Attorney General

4 /s/ Jeffrey Rupert

JEFFREY RUPERT, WSBA #45037
Division Chief

5 KRISTIN BENESKI, WSBA #45478
Assistant Attorney General

6 TODD BOWERS, WSBA #25274
Deputy Attorney General

7 JEFFREY T. SPRUNG, WSBA #23607
ZACH JONES, WSBA #44557

8 Assistant Attorneys General
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Washington